

Exhibit B

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP

BENEDICT Y. HUR (SBN: 224018)

bhur@willkie.com

SIMONA AGNOLUCCI (SBN: 246943)

sagnolucci@willkie.com

EDUARDO E. SANTACANA (SBN: 281668)

esantacana@willkie.com

LORI C. ARAKAKI (SBN: 315119)

larakaki@willkie.com

Attorneys for
GOOGLE LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO**

ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, *et al.* individually and
on behalf of all other similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs

GOOGLE LLC, *et al.*

Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-CV-04688

**[PROPOSED] ORDER RE: PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION TO COMPEL REGULATOR
DOCUMENTS**

Judge: Hon. Alex G. Tse
Courtroom: A, 15th Floor
Action Filed: July 14, 2020
Trial Date: Not Set

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Before the Court is the parties' joint letter brief regarding Plaintiffs' request for documents provided to regulators. Having considered the joint letter brief, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's request for an Order that Google (1) confirm whether there are any current regulatory investigations relating to WAA, and (2) produce all WAA-related documents provided to any such regulator.

N.D. Cal. Local Rule 7-9 requires leave of Court before a party files a motion for reconsideration. Plaintiffs here did not do that, but appear to be seeking reconsideration of this Court's decision regarding RFP No. 1. Dkt. 85. Now, as then, Plaintiffs have failed to carry their burden to show that Google should review over a hundred privacy investigations for stray mentions of WAA, especially now that discovery has closed.

That a Google witness testified that he was aware of a WAA-related investigation does not change that analysis.

Nor will this Court Order Google to produce all WAA-related documents provided to any regulator. This Court ruled that Google need not respond to RFP No. 1, and RFP No. 3 is focused only on the *Arizona* litigation, not any regulatory investigation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____

Honorable Alex G. Tse
United States Magistrate Judge